DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 165 702 HE 011 016

AUTHOR Duryea, E. D.
TITLE Perceptions of Faculty-Governing Board Relations, 1900-1969.
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Buffalo. Faculty of Educational Studies.
PUB DATE Sep 78
NOTE 36p.; An occasional paper
AVAILABLE FROM Department of Education, 479 Baldy Hall, State University of New York, Buffalo, NY 14260

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; College Governing Councils; *Educational History; *Governance; *Governing Boards; *Higher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Labor Unions; Power Structure; Presidents; Teacher Participation; Teacher Role; Trustees; *University Administration
IDENTIFIERS *Board Teacher Relationship

ABSTRACT

During the twentieth century a movement may be seen toward the delegation of control in college and university governance by governing boards to faculties. By the 1960's, joint effort or shared authority had been achieved on a limited number of campuses, and sought increasingly on others. However, several concomitant developments occurred. The growing recognition of the professoriate's role in governance made necessary an increase in the power of presidents and a broadening of their administrative staffs. In addition, the literature reflects the situations of only a limited number of institutions, especially those that have moved toward shared authority. Finally, collective bargaining has created a new basis for internal relationships, changing perspectives on shared authority. In this decade, relationships between governing boards and the professoriate have reached a juncture with two avenues ahead: one of the traditional commitment to shared authority and the other of unionism and collective bargaining. The academic profession will probably proceed along both routes for the foreseeable future, though they have different implications for the role of governing boards. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED165702

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dept of H.E.
Suny Buffalo

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS."

HE 011 016

OCCASIONAL PAPERS SERIES

Department of Higher Education
Faculty of Educational Studies
State University of New York at Buffalo

The Occasional Papers Series of the Department of Higher Education is a forum for research and analysis by scholars associated with the Department and its work. The Department of Higher Education, as part of the State University of New York, concerns itself with issues of relevance to New York and the broader higher education community. For information, write to the Chairman, Department of Higher Education, 479 Baldy Hall, State University of New York at Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y. 14260.

PERCEPTIONS OF
FACULTY-GOVERNING BOARD RELATIONS
1900 - 1969

by

E. D. Duryea, Professor
Department of Higher Education
State University of New York/Buffalo

Septem[illegible] 1978

FOREWORD

This is the first in a series of papers which the Department of Higher Education at the State University of New York at Buffalo will be publishing. The purpose of the series is to make available to a professional public, especially other departments of higher education, research findings and scholarly analyses which, for one reason or another, do not fit precisely for publication in regular journals.

Further reports in this series will be issued from time to time as appropriate papers are submitted which the editorial board and its advisors feel are worthy of dissemination.

This paper by Professor Duryea on Perceptions of Faculty-Governing Board Relations 1900-1969 represents one facet of a larger line of research which he is pursuing dealing with the overall history of the government of higher education in the United States.

PERSPECTIVE

Non-academic governing boards, holding final legal authority as corporate or semi-corporate bodies, have provided the government of American colleges and universities a relationship with the professoriate and with the external society unique in the history of western universities. In the private sector, they function as corporations chartered by state governments; in the public, they serve on an authority conferred through statutory or constitutional incorporated status or its equivalent. In this capacity, boards have mediated between the requirements of public interest and of their internal constituencies, serving as a buffer, and occasionally a bulwark, against the more direct intrusions of political, economic, and at times religious pressures for conformity to special interests.

In law, the establishing legal enactments have assigned to boards a final authority for the management of their institutions. In practice, however, they have found it necessary over time to recognize limitations of this formal authority and accede to internal and external interests. Thus, they have accepted a degree of professorial primacy for academic affairs and personnel policies. They have recognized the need to accept external influences in the formulation of programmatic, financial, and development policies emanating from private and public sources of income and of legitimization. During the course of the present century, as a consequence, boards have tended to sustain a balance among three competing considerations: those inherent in their corporate or statutory responsibilities; those associated with internal constituencies including largely faculty members but also students and administrative personnel; and those related to the necessity of a responsiveness to external interests including the state and federal governments, alumni, donors, and more recently the courts.

The centrality of governing boards for the government of colleges and universities has motivated in recent years a growing body of literature focussed on their role and function. In the main, discussions and studies have been directed either to the manner in which boards handle their affairs and how this can be improved or how well they represent the interests of society. Implicit or explicit through the literature one finds the assumption expressed in a report to the Association of Governing Boards by John W. Nason, as follows:

> It is the thesis of this essay that the governing boards of higher education, if they are prepared to rise to the opportunities, have a more important role in the years ahead than at any time in this century. (1974, p. 1)

A review of the history of boards during the past seven decades, however, suggests the possibility of an alternative assumption, one not nearly so optimistic, which raises a question largely neglected in the current literature. To what extent has the necessity for boards to accommodate to internal and external influences upon institutional decision making impaired their ability to implement their legal responsibilities?

This paper reports the results of a limited investigation of one aspect of campus government, that of board relationships with the professoriat since the turn of the century, as a partial response to the question. It conveys the findings of a review of the perceptions by board members, presidents, faculty members, and educators concerning the internal role of governing boards and their acceptance of faculty influence in governance, expressed in educational and professional journals, books, and reports of governmental agencies and educational associations from 1900 to 1970.* As such, it represents the first of several historical studies directed to answering the basic research question stated above.**

---

* A complete listing of sources used for the study accompanies this report. The quotations and documentation were derived selectively to convey the sense of the findings as interpreted by the author.

** Initiated several years ago by a historical review of the origins in medieval and English precedents of the corporate form as the basis of college and university government in this country, culminating with the founding of the early colleges and the Dartmouth College Case decision of 1819.

The turn of the present century was chosen as a starting point, because by that time the present system of higher education had taken form. Prior to the Civil War, there was no question of the direct, at times very personal, overview on the part of board members. American higher education consisted of small, four-year colleges very largely associated with a religious denomination although by no means as theological schools. Difficulties of transportation and communication encouraged a substantial degree of geographical intimacy. By the first World War, however, the unity of the early colleges had given way to a more diversified system of colleges and universities, both public and private, with board membership spread over states and even regions and the nation for some private institutions. Internal complexity had required the embryonic form of contemporary administrative structures, and presidents had emerged as powerful executives responsible to boards for their administrations. In effect, the modern system of governance had taken form, although the final, legal authority of the boards remained.

At the outset of the study, however, one critical but not unexpected limitation became apparent. The literature reflects conditions and values associated with the larger, more eminent universities and colleges. Their trustees, presidents, and faculty members have tended to be more vocal and thus the more prevalent spokesmen. Furthermore, representatives of these campuses have exercised greater influence in the associations and committees which contribute to the literature. Undoubtedly in many colleges, especially the smaller and church related ones, traditional relationships of the earlier years persisted. What this study has assumed is the point stressed in the book of David Riesman, Constraint and Variety in American Education, that the larger universities and leading colleges on the whole have proven pace setters for higher education, establishing patterns and values which the others have subsequently adopted. (1958)

The findings of this investigation fall into two fairly discrete chronological periods which serve as the structure which follows the first two decades of this century and the period from the 1920s into the 1960s. The concept of the faculty member as a professional with the

expertise to participate in institutional governance gained at least a general recognition among educational leaders by the early 1920s. From then until the disturbances of the late 1960s and the advent of faculty collective bargaining in the present decade the literature evidences a gradual acceptance of the idea that boards should accede to faculty recommendations affecting academic affairs and personnel policies.

THE FIRST TWO DECADES

"The business of the university faculties is teaching. It is not legislation and it is not administration," Andrew S. Draper, Commissioner of Education for New York State, declared bluntly in a 1906 article. (Draper, 1906, p. 38) His article instigated widespread discussion in the periodicals of the day regarding the nature of college and university administration. As might be expected for an epoch which had experienced an unprecedented and successful business and industrial expansion, the comparison with business organization characterized a major segment of this discussion. Draper reflected much of this sentiment when he contrasted the relationship of the president of a university and his board of trustees to that of the President of the United States and the Congress and then insisted that "not only must the teaching staff be developed, the work must be organized." (p. 39) And this was the responsibility of the trustees through their executive, the president. Faculty, in his view, served just as any other employees.

The impress of businessmen upon the academic enterprise has been well documented. Walter Metzger in his book, Academic Freedom in the Age of the University, describes the changing occupational background of trustees during the latter part of the nineteenth century. "Whereas wealth and a talent for business had once been considered virtues in trustees, now they were thought to be prerequisites," he wrote. (p. 141) He identifies the domination of major universities by industrialists who had contributed substantially to their resources. Similarly, Mark Beach in a dissertation

entitled, Professors, Presidents and Trustees: A Study of University Governance, 1825-1918, documents the intrusion of the "business model" as the basis for institutional management. (Ch. IX) In his history of the era, The Emergence of the American University, Laurence Veysey comments, "It is easy to see why academic institutions came in many ways to resemble businesses." (p. 353) Underlying the press for administrative organization based upon the business model and for efficiency in the educational endeavor was a clear perception of trustees as the equivalent of corporation boards. Their control was final; their responsibility that of direct involvement in decisions which directed all affairs, educational as well as financial.

However, along with the resemblance of universities to businesses, Veysey also points out that "it is more interesting, possibly, to observe the ways in which they did not." (p. 353) The academic enterprise had undergone dramatic changes over the decades preceding 1900. It was no longer a "pinched and small-scale enterprise," but one which had multiplied almost eleven times its income when that of the nation as a whole had quadrupled. (Metzger, 1965, p. 229) Enrollments had doubled. Curriculum had diversified. In fact, as Veysey states, "The American university of 1900 was all but unrecognizable in comparison with the college of 1860." (p. 2) It had achieved a respectability in the public eye which had gained for it increasing support from both private philanthropy and state governments.

Organizationally, two conditions critical to the metamorphosis of higher education proved also critical to the manner in which governing boards functioned. Led by the major universities, higher institutions were expanding their enrollments and becoming increasingly complex as departments, schools, and service functions multiplied in consort with the enrollments and, even more significantly, with the growth of specialized knowledge. As a consequence, boards found themselves removed from their previous intimacy with their campuses and forced to rely upon their executive, the president, and newly created administrative officers. Concurrently, during final decades of the nineteenth century scholars,

especially scientific scholars, had laid out an exhilerating array of new knowledge in a broadening variety of fields; and engineers, agriculturalists, architects, doctors, students of business administration, and even teachers had embarked upon its application to improve their professional competence. The universities became centers for both. In the process, the professor became increasingly a specialist and expert; and, as such, his sense of his worth and of his place in the university was heightened. Both conditions entered into discussions of the functions and relationships of trustees.

The shift in operating control from trustees to presidents and faculties was confirmed by the seasoned and powerful executive, President Nicholas M. Butler of Columbia University. "The records of the University," he explained in his 1917 annual report, "make plain that before 1887 or thereabouts, the Trustees concerned themselves not only with the government of the university, but directly with its administration. Since July 1, 1887, however, and more completely since 1892, the Statutes of the University have put all initiative and virtually complete responsibility for the educational policies and work of the University in the hands of the University Council and the several faculties. These bodies are, by their nature, legislative, and the execution of policies authorized by them is confided to the President, to Deans, to Directors, to Secretaries, and to other appropriate officers of administration." The Trustees, he noted, "as distinct from their legal powers and authority, are to care for the property and funds of the corporation, to erect and to maintain the buildings necessary for the work of the University, and to appropriate annually the sums which in their judgment are necessary and expedient for the carrying on of the University's work." (Elliott, 1937, pp. 383-4) He recognized that the Trustees selected and appointed the President. Most significantly, he submitted that appointments to the teaching staff had been made over this period, with two exceptions, only upon recommendation and advice of members of representatives of the professoriate.

The Columbia experience reflected not only the increasing complexity within the University but changes in educational programs. The fixed,

classical curriculum of the earlier colleges had given way to an expanding number of academic specializations, in turn evidenced in a parallel departmentalization of the academic program. Departments were accompanied by the advent of professional schools which appeared with few exceptions first as departments and then as separate entities which, in their turn, procreated their own departments. Writing about his own University of Pennsylvania in 1915, for example, historian Edward Cheyney, underscored this condition with the question whether "the board of trustees judge which of these 400 or more men [faculty members] are capable of performance of the services for which the University needs them." (p. 804) Of necessity, he noted, trustees and presidents have to rely upon nomination from the various departments. Responding to similar considerations President Schurman of Cornell about the same time acknowledged the necessity of faculty input into decisions affecting educational affairs, despite the fact that the president and trustees held the "reins of power" and exercised "supreme legal control." (1912)

Within administration, academic expansion was accompanied by a parallel administrative dispersion of function manifested by registrars, librarians, bursars, deans of men and women on the one hand and vice presidents and academic deans on the other. A 1936 study by Earl J. McGrath charts the growth from a median of three or four administrative officers in the 1880s to a median of nearly sixty for the larger universities by the 1930s. (McGrath, 1936b)

Concurrently, the role of the professor was undergoing a rather fundamental change. Prior to the Civil War, he served as teacher and disciplinarian, as much responsible for the moral conduct of the students as for their learning. He was a member of a small, collegiate family presided over by a paternal president and a board of trustees quite intimately involved with the institution. Except for the smaller colleges, already beginning to find themselves on the fringe of higher education's main stream, by the first two decades of the present century the professoriate had begun to identify itself with a discipline or professional specialization. Graduate study was becoming routine for new entrants who carried

with them the values associated with research and publication. A new plethora of national disciplinary and professional associations were gaining the primary loyalties of more and more faculty members. Universities were achieving a recognition for their importance to the society well beyond that of the earlier colleges. In sum, these changes created among many academicians a new sense of their worth, that indeed they might be employees but they held a special status. In turn, the sense emerged among many faculty that presidents and administrators had a primary obligation to provide the conditions and support necessary for their academic endeavors. The more vocal articulated a perception of universities in which faculties, presidents and boards worked together as equals, each having a different area of competence necessary for the total enterprise.

"The university is not merely a corporation, a legal body holding funds and exercising certain powers," one such professor wrote, "It is a great organization in which the trustees hold an honorable and responsible place, but in which the faculties hold an independent place, with equal responsibilities." (Cheyney, 1915, p. 795) He noted further that faculty members are "appointees but not employees." Along the same line, one college president in 1905, referred to the subordination of professors to trustees as contrary to "the real interests of educational progress." (Stevenson, p. 844) In the same year, President Charles W. Eliot of Harvard made a similar comment. "The governing bodies of American Universities being generally composed of men not themselves experts in any of the university's activities," he affirmed in the magazine Science, "the real direction of those activities devolves on the professor and other teachers; and there is no avoiding this delegation of power." (pp. 775-6)

The extreme voice of a professionalized faculty demanding a place in the university sun came from a professor of psychology at Columbia University, James McKeen Cattell. As editor of Science, he held a good position for communicating his disaffection with things as they were. His complaints took the form of numerous articles attacking the existing form of government

and urging the "ultimate control on a democratic basis." (1913, p. 18) Cattell's plan, as a proposal to "our leading men of science," an estimated 1,000 in all, called for a replacement of existing boards by a corporation consisting of professors and other officers of the university, alumni, and members of the community. "This corporation should elect trustees having the ordinary functions of trustees -- the care of property and the representation of the common sense of the corporation and of the community in university policy." Professors should elect presidents. The basic units -- schools, divisions, or departments -- should elect their administrative heads and executive committees, and in turn be represented on a university senate, "subject to the veto of trustees." (1913, p. 18) The response to Cattell's survey was not overwhelming, fewer than a third replied, of whom about 60 percent supported such radical reforms, but he did receive some affirmation. (1913, pp. 22-24) He was not alone in seeking recognition of a new professorial importance in institutional government.

Following rather quickly upon Cattell's propagandizing, a more moderate but organized movement materialized. At the initiative of eighteen full professors from Johns Hopkins, 150 academicians selected for their disciplinary status, joined a proposed American Association of University Professors. The Association held its first meeting in 1915, at which participants voiced their concerns. They feared that the expansion of higher education would threaten academic standards; they felt underpaid in contrast to other occupations; they felt insecure about opportunities for promotion and advancement. However, it was the issue of academic freedom which first grasped the attention of the new association; its first committee (Committee A) formed to look into academic freedom and tenure. In subsequent years other committees concerned with various aspects of professional interest were formed, including one on faculty self-government, Committee T, set up in 1916 with Professor James A. Leighton as chairman and Professor Cattell as a member.

The history of Committee T lacks the flamboyance and radical dedication of Cattell. Rather, the Committee has proven ameliorative in posture, striving for faculty involvement in decision making and for improved communication with governing boards. One suspects this resulted largely

because in general professors did not share Cattell's extremism and preferred to encourage secure relationships within the existing organizational system. Certainly, the early meetings of the Association demonstrated no ground swell toward the more radical position. The initial report of the Committee in 1920 did not instigate any follow-up action. In fact, the Committee remained dormant until into the 1930s.

Yet, one can derive from its first report in 1920 insights into the actual role of governing boards of that era which confirm the perceptions appearing in periodicals and in the reports and discussions of college and university presidents. In the introduction, written by its Chairman, J. A. Leighton, the Committee recognized two logical extremes for university organization: the autocratic, bureaucratic type and the democratic type. In the first type, boards held complete authority, implemented through their executive, the president. In the second, faculty members would control educational policies, admission to its ranks of new members, nomination of presidents and administrators, and the formulation of budgets. The Committee report recognized that "the board of trustees is commonly endowed with absolute power to appoint and dismiss the president, other administrative officers, and faculty; to determine the outlay for salaries, equipment, buildings, and grounds; to decide educational policies; to vote honorary degrees without the consent of the faculty." However, it notes, "in practice faculties exercise by use and wont, a very considerable influence in the selection and promotion of their own members, and even, at times, in the selection of presidents and deans. Autocratic in structure, the best institutions are thus more or less democratic in practice, although in widely varying degrees." (Comm T, 1924, p. 24)

In the view of the Committee, trustees lack the time and ability to manage the educational affairs of their institutions and thus relied to a high degree upon presidents, at times in consort with a small trustee executive committee and at times with "almost complete headway." (Comm T, 1924, p. 25) The consequence of this situation was a tendency to presidential autocracy, not because such leaders are "born autocrats" but because of a habit of action intrinsic in expectations on the part of the trustees,

the public, and the faculty for him "to get results." "The responsibility is tremendous and the temptations insidious and insistent," exacerbated by the fact that too many professors look upon the university "chiefly as a place where their own departmental speciality can be practiced without let or hindrance." (Comm T, 1924, pp. 27-8)

The sense of the 1920 Committee T report was confirmed in discussions appearing in the literature of the first two decades of this century. In his 1900 book, College Administration, Charles W. Thwing referred to the trustees and faculty as "the two bodies to which is generally committed the administration of the college." (p. 21) Reflecting discussions with the presidents of a variety of universities and colleges, he confirmed that there had appeared a growing recognition of the professional status of the professoriate and its right to some participation in institutional decision making. He identified "two prevailing methods" of administration. "There is a democratic method," he wrote, "in which the Faculty takes the initiative and does the larger part of the work in finding a new member for itself." He tagged the other method "the monarchical method, in which the President takes the initiative and in which he may, with or without conferring on his associates of the Faculty, cause an election to be made by the Board. . ." (p. 28) Thwing, himself, felt that the board and faculty "may in certain ways be considered two coordinate bodies." (p. 29)

Other commentators convey the same sense, that at least in the major universities and established colleges, boards of trustees in practice were limiting their role to general planning and policy determination and confining their managerial functions to the care of property and handling of finances. Despite the charge laid upon them for final legal responsibility for the welfare of an institution and, especially, its solvency, they relied extensively upon the executive, the president, and his staff; but the conduct of educational affairs and related matters was shifting to faculties. From the beginning the trustees at Johns Hopkins had recognized the professional status of faculty members and relied upon them for advice upon academic and student affairs, an informal practice codified by the

establishment of an Academic Council consisting of full professors in 1880 responsible for internal affairs. (Beach, 1966, p. 233) During the administration of its original president, Daniel Coit Gilman, there evolved a distinction between the role of the Council for academic as distinct from that of the trustees for financial affairs. The University of Chicago opened with a similar body, the Senate composed of the President, full professors, and the University Librarian to have purview in all educational matters. (Goodspeed, 1972, p. 140) "Certainly at Cornell," President Schurman wrote, "the supremacy of the faculty in all educational matters has been maintained for a score of years." (1912, p. 703-5) At Yale, the various schools held a substantial autonomy, and nominations by each faculty to the corporation were nearly always confirmed. (University Control, 1912, pp. 964-7) Trustees at Stanford in 1904 established an elected Advisory Board or Council to serve with the president and provided for elected faculty committees. (Alden, 1907, p. 12) Speaking from the vantage of Harvard, President A. Lawrence Lowell wrote of the faculty as a "society or guild of scholars" and proposed that the relation with boards was "one of mutual cooperation for the promotion of the scholars' work." (1921, p. 236) A trustee of the University of Illinois observing that the "scheme of organization and methods of operation for business to be best also for universities" nonetheless recognized the practical limitations upon boards. They are no more competent, he wrote, "to formulate the teaching policy. . . than they are to do the teaching." (Abbott, 1920, pp. 445-6) Trustees at Reed College in 1915 adopted a plan of organization which included a Council consisting of the President and eight elected faculty representatives. (Foster, 1916, p. 595) Finally, in an informal survey of twenty-two of the leading universities, President Charles R. Van Hise (of Wisconsin) concluded that, while in general presidents recommend faculty appointments and promotions to boards, they uniformly consulted with faculty bodies and departments as well as appropriate deans. (1911, pp. 238-41)

By the third decade of the century, the organizational pattern of American higher education had taken its current form. In one dimension, it manifested a bureaucratic relationship with power centered in a chief executive, the president, who oversaw an academic hierarchy of vice

presidents, deans, and chairmen and a managerial hierarchy of financial and services functions, consisting of such officers as registrars and bursars, deans of men and women, librarians, and even alumni secretaries. In another, moving from a base in a departmental structure accompanying the extension of specialized knowledge, faculty members had begun to organize a parallel governmental structure of senates, councils, and committees. (Duryea, 1973, pp. 26-8) For trustees, both increased their distance from the ongoing operation of institutions and their understanding of its academic endeavors. As an industrialist and board member of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology phrased it, he and his associates found "less and less opportunity for usefulness in a machinery so elaborate that any incursion into it by those unfamiliar may do infinite harm. . . The modern trustee has gradually withdrawn from the teaching side of the college to fix his attention upon those questions or revenue, housing and legislation which have multiplied even faster than the undergraduates." (Monroe, 1913, p. 465)

While the general pattern for institutional government had become clear enough for the major institutions, exceptions and variations were plentiful. In many small colleges, boards continued to dominate all decision making, through their executives, the presidents, and through personal intervention. But even the New England small college, long a major bastion of the earlier system, had by the turn of the century become a "significantly altered institution." The paternal president and dominating board, committed to moral discipline and an almost personal supervision of college affairs, were disappearing. (Peterson, 1964, Ch. V) What in fact had begun to become clear was, at least in embryonic form, a system of authority shared by trustees, presidents, and faculty members, not without some resemblance to the balance of power concept associated with the American political system of executive, legislature, and the courts. There was established the basis at least for the shared authority ideology which has undergirded the posture of the American Association of University Professors and which was to serve as the lodestar for those who sought to enhance the influence of professors as professionals with the right to participate in decisions affecting their endeavors.

1920 - 1960

The literature on governing boards and internal governance during the four decades following 1920 evidences a preoccupation with internal relationships. It was not until into the 1960s that commentators began to express concern about the impact of federal supervision and about the intrusions of state governments into internal operations. The bulk of those who addressed themselves to the role of boards commented upon the need for a redefinition of board role in the conduct of its responsibilities for fiscal, managerial, and educational affairs. The major thrust of the community during this second period is contained in the following comment of the President of the University of Kentucky in an address at the inauguaration of a presidential neighbor.

> Unquestionably the functions of boards of trustees are being materially modified in these days and there are many instances where the view set forth in this discussion has been accepted and the educational policy of the institution determined by the teaching staff. (McVey, 1928, p. 708)

His view was that the educational purposes of universities required that the faculty "instead of being subordinated would be looked upon as a body of experts engaged in the development of educational processes," leaving boards with a primary concern for the business affairs, physical plant, and external relations. "Boards of trustees and faculties," he proposed, "are cooperating factors . . . and administrative officers are their executive agents." (p. 705)

By the 1930s, one finds the frequently repeated proposal of President Edward C. Elliott of Purdue University that the first and foremost function of a board was "the selection of the president" and "the firm guidance and sympathetic support" of him and his executive officers. (Palmer, 1931, p. 505) Similarly, in his report of 1936, President Butler of Columbia described his role as chief executive in terms of the achievement of "educational unity and cooperation of the educational system" while allowing

for the autonomy of units within the University's system. In a more academic view, based upon his continuing studies of the government of nigher education, M. M. Chambers in 1938 proposed that boards serve as quasi-legislative bodies for public higher education, standing between state legislatures and the institution. In this regard, they would have a responsibility for the maintenance of external relationships. Internally, Chambers felt that boards had an overseeing role carried out in close association with presidents and a "quasi-judicial function" as final arbiter or as "an administrative court." (1938, pp. 532-5)

Throughout the 1940s and 1950s, the literature reiterates the same and similar themes. First, it is explicitly recognized that boards hold "complete legal responsibility for the welfare of the institutions which they represent." (McGrath, 1936, p. 259) It is then formulated that this legal power has undergone modification through the developing "traditions of relative independence in college life." (Dibden, 1958, p. 543) As a professor at California Institute of Technology explained, trustees and faculties must inevitably interact and their respective roles in this interaction does not allow for sharp delineation, as in a constitutional charter. (Munroe, 1941, pp. 315-22) In the words of one professor of law "it can be said that in some of our more enlightened institutions the spirit of the organization is that of a partnership of trustees, officers, and faculty, each contributing according to its own talents." (Bogert, 1945, p. 82) Perhaps the most ebullient description was that of the trustees of the Carnegie Fouocation for the Advancement of Teaching. "The heart of the university community," their statement read, "is the men and women who carry forward the . . . central tasks of teaching and research. All of the university's machinery is, or should be, designed to facilitate the performance of those tasks and to heighten the affectiveness of those men and women. Good trustees should never forget that basic responsibility." (Carnegie Foundation, 1962, p. 12)

"The net effect of the reconsideration of university government by many boards during the last few decades," George C. Bogert reported in a 1945 address to the trustees of the University of Chicago, "has been

numerous revisions of the statutes in the direction of clearer definition of function, better opportunities for communication between trustees and faculties, and substantial increase in faculty power." Professor Bogert reported that nearly all of the major universities had established committees, councils, and senates with provision for faculty representation. Referring to the trustees present, as a faculty member of the University he recognized that "our board has been a leader in enlisting faculty assistance in university government." (pp. 80-1)

By midcentury in the major universities the dualism between the corporate authority of boards and their policies in practice appeared well established. As Professor W. H. Cowley, a leading analyst of higher education at that time, wrote in 1951, "today few boards mix into administrative matters, and those of all the better institutions have turned over the area of educational and investigational power to faculties." (p. 219) The resulting balance of power left faculty members primarily in academic affairs subject to board vetoes which, although seldom apparent, were exercised from time to time when controversial issues arose.

An explicit recognition of this condition appeared in a trustee committee report entitled, The Role of the Trustees of Columbia University (1957) which read, in part, as follows: "The legal supremacy of trustees and their final authority to act as they wish is unquestioned, but the most experienced trustees are themselves constantly warning their newer colleagues that overactivity in certain areas -- particularly in the area of education itself -- is as great a sin against the modern spirit of trusteeship as is neglect." (Columbia University, p. 9) The committee recognized the historical modification of trustee power as universities became more complex and larger and accepted the delegation of an increasing voice in institutional affairs not only to presidents, as their agents, but to faculty members as specialists and professionals. The report stressed and elaborated what it perceived as the three major legal responsibilities of boards; namely, to select the president, to be finally responsible for funds and properties, and to oversee and approve "the kind

of education offered . . . and make certain that its quality meets the highest standards possible." (p. 20)

Professor Bogert who recognized the advances in faculty participation warned in the same address that "the trend shown in these leading institutions does not exist universally." (1945, p. 81) His observation was confirmed in reports of studies conducted by Committee T of the AAUP. In 1941, the Committee published a 1939 study of 228 colleges and universities. While the data conveyed only faculty perceptions and is not entirely clear in all instances, a summary of the responses received indicates that in two-thirds of the colleges and universities covered faculty had no voice in the selection of presidents and that in three-quarters no plan of communication with boards existed. In fewer than one-third were faculties consulted on the appointment of deans. In 177 institutions, departmental heads were appointed without formal faculty voice. While 129 institutions apparently had established senates or similar councils, in only eleven did faculty elect their membership. (1941, p. 156) "In brief, in a typical institution in 1941," a subsequent Committee report stated, "the board of trustees appointed the president, the president appointed the deans, and the deans, in turn, designated the departmental executives." (1946, p. 60)

It should be noted, however, that despite evidence of very modest faculty involvement in governance outside of major universities, the responses to the Committee T survey did express some feeling of progress in that direction. Faculty members on 99 campuses reported that they experienced more participation than previously, in contrast to 25 who indicated to the contrary and 88 who perceived no change.

In 1953, the Committee reported again, this time on observations received from 115 of its 460 chapters. It was able to discern a continued trend on the part of boards and presidents "in the direction of consulting faculties . . . concerning their policies and personnel: but no evidence of widespread commitment to any major dispersal of board authority."(p. 311) Contrasting responses from 78 institutions reporting in 1939, the Committee

found 60 which sensed a "net improvement" of procedures supporting faculty participation as against 10 with no change and eight indicating net losses.

During the academic year 1969-70, a Survey SubCommittee of Committee T conducted a much more ambitious study which was reported a year later. Responses from both administrations and AAUP chapters in 970 colleges and universities (651 of which submitted joint replies) substantiated that the trend perceived in 1941 and 1953 had proven pervasive although by no means universal. In academic affairs, faculty members held a final voice or shared through joint action with administrators in the determinations on such matters as curriculum, degree requirements, academic performance of students, the establishment of new programs, and admissions requirements in more than two-thirds of the institutions represented. For personnel policies related to appointments, promotions, tenure, and dismissals, faculty members participated through joint action, consultation, or discussion in more than three-quarters of the cases. Similarly, the report presented evidence of a major involvement by faculty members in governmental affairs having to do with committees and senates or similar bodies.* (1971, pp. 69-70) As in previous surveys by the Committee, the results reflected a spectrum in the level of participation ranging from substantial faculty influence and de facto control at one end to complete administration domination or no participation at the other.

Thus, by the close of the 1960s, the initial position of the AAUP Committee T in 1920 had gained a general credence in higher education. At that earlier time, the Committee recognized the final authority of boards, but pressed in practice for a "very considerable influence" by faculties in the selection and promotion of their own members "and at times in the

---

* The survey instrument for the study used 31 types of decisions in four major categories: academic affairs, personnel policies, administrative or managerial considerations (physical plant, planning, salary determinations, etc.), and student personnel affairs, although it did not classify items in this manner. Responses were sorted into five categories: faculty determination, joint action, consultation, discussion, and no participation.

selection of presidents and deans." It urged the "joint determination, by trustees and faculties, of what is included in the term educational policies" and "joint responsibility and control varying with the particular aspect of the whole matter of conduct of university affairs which may be uppermost in a given situation." A survey of the literature at the close of the 1960s revealed a general consensus that boards "should hold the basic legal document of origin, develop the purpose of the institution, seek planned development, select and determine the tenure of the president, hold assets in trust and act as a court of last resort . . ." But, the survey recognized, "with such board duties and only a few days in which to meet and formally conduct business, the board obviously delegates much of its authority. In fact the literature . . . strongly indicates that the board is expected to consider only basic policy matters while leaving day-to-day operations to the faculty and administration." (Harvey, 1971, p. 1)

If one were to look for a capstone action in the gradual delegation during the twentieth century of governing board authority to the professoriate, the joint statement of three major associations in 1966 most appropriately fits the niche. The American Council on Education and Association of Governing Boards joined with the AAUP in characterizing the governance of colleges and universities as a "joint effort" made imperative by the "variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education." (AAUP, . . ., 1966, p. 376) While in the context of the student activism of that time joint effort included "students and others," faculty priority was recognized "for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods, instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process." (p. 378) It recommended appropriate governing agencies at the department, school, institutional, and system levels for the exercise of this faculty responsibility. The statement established by a formal document for a national constituency the governing board-professoriate relationships which up to that time had gained credence in the literature and in practice on the campuses of major institutions.

CONCLUSION

For the course of the twentieth century, the evidence does support a slow but consistent movement toward the delegation of control in university and college governance on the part of governing boards to faculties. By the 1960s, the concept of joint effort or shared authority had become at least an aspiration achieved fully in a limited number of campuses but certainly sought increasingly on most of the others. However, in appraising this evolution several considerations arise which bear upon any conclusions which may be drawn from the literature.

In the first place, many of the same forces which underlay the growing recognition of the professoriate's role in governance made necessary an increase in the power of presidents and a broadening of their administrative staffs. There is an assumption in this regard that the president constitutes an extension of the board for which he serves as executive officer. Thus, the increasing presidential reliance upon faculty involvement in governance represents the movement outward, or downward, of board authority. This it does, but in a different context, since in practice the administrative phalanx on campuses has become a separate governing force in itself. Especially in larger colleges and universities, trustees have come to function as overseers far more than directors, and faculty relationships with boards in the context of the foregoing discussion have evolved through interaction with administrators.

Secondly, as recognized at the outset, the literature available for this kind of an analysis speaks for sources at one end of a spectrum of institutions. One has only to examine carefully the data in the 1969-70 Committee T survey (discussed in the last section) to confirm the diversity across this spectrum. Large numbers of colleges, and many universities, have moved very slowly toward increasing faculty involvement and continue to manifest domination by administration and board. This by no means offsets the evidence of the importance in recent decades of the shared authority ideal and the general tendency of all campuses to shift at least

to some degree in that direction. The academic milieu at the graduate universities assumes faculty prerogatives in government which inevitably rub off on the graduate students who in turn become faculty members at the overwhelming majority of colleges and universities. They carry these academic values with them, as do to a lesser degree many administrative officeers who obtain doctorates or who hold academic deanships or similar posts and have moved over from the professorial ranks.

It is not surprising, therefore, that one can discern a parallelism between the influence of the professoriate and its professionalization and demonstrated research and scholarly achievement and appointments in major, graduate universities. Clearly, faculty influence tends to have its greatest weight in these universities in consort with specialized knowledge. The departmental structure has given an organizational dimension to specialization, of course. Departments have provided the means for a counterforce within academe to the authority of boards and administrators, but they also have proven a divisive factor as far as a common faculty voice in government is concerned. The commitment to specialization, in this sense, has induced over time a fragmentation of faculty relationships. As Sociologist Burton R. Clark has phrased it, "faculty authority becomes less of a case of self-government by a total collegium, and more a case of authority exercised department by department, sub-college by sub-college." The role of faculty in internal decision making has taken on a parochial stance with an increasing concern for the autonomy of separate disciplines and of individuals. (Clark, 1970, p. 96)

Finally, and very likely most significantly for this discussion, at the very point in time when the concept of shared authority was accepted as a major academic ideal, a new force entered the academic arena. Buttressed by federal and state statutes which rivaled, on the scales of legality exercised by governmental agencies and the courts, the legal authority of boards, collective bargaining became a right for faculty members and brought into being, most fundamentally and pervasively, a new basis for internal relationships. The context of the two was not

overlooked by a task force of the American Association for Higher Education in 1967. While expressing a "preference for the shared authority-academic senate model" of internal governance under board patronage, it nonetheless recognized the "arrival of bargaining agencies, such as unions." (p. 57) It hopefully affirmed that unions do not pose an "inexorable threat to the fundamental nature of higher education," but had to support the view "that when a majority of the faculty in an appropriate unit prefer to be represented by a bargaining agency, this choice should be given full recognition." The task force perceptively anticipated the trends of the seventies in this regard.

Manifestly, the development reviewed in the limited study which this paper reports touch upon one facet of the forces affecting the role and function of governing boards. It attests to the recognition during the course of the century of the professional status of faculty members in their relationships with their institutions and to the necessity of boards, as might be expected, to recognize and respond to the changing character of higher education and academic institutions. As noted at the outset, the insights are limited to published beliefs and perceptions which reflect changing conditions but do not on the whole favor us with much insight into causal factors. This latter consideration must rest, of course, with a broader investigation of the total history of colleges and universities. In any event, relationships between governing boards and the professoriate have reached in this decade a juncture with two avenues ahead, one that of the traditional commitment to shared authority and the other that of unionism and collective bargaining. Very likely the academic profession will proceed along both routes for the foreseeable future; both have different implications for the role and function of governing boards.

SOURCES

ABBOTT, William L., "Functions of the Governing Board in the Administration of the University," School and Society, 12:445-9, November 13, 1920.

ALDEN, R. M., "College Authority," Nation, 85:12-13, July 4, 1907.

ALEXANDER, Kern, and Erwin S. Solomon, College and University Law, The Michie Company (Charlottesville, Va.), 1972.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, "Faculty Participation in College and University Government: Statement of Principles Approved by the Council on October 26, 1962," AAUP Bulletin, 48:321-3, December 1962.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS, AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION, ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS, "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," AAUP Bulletin, 52:375-9, Winter 1966.

ANDREWS, E. Benjamin, "University Administration," Educational Review, 31:217-25, March 1906.

ANTHONY, A. W., "Are Trustees Trustees?" Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 18:325-7, November 1932.

ANTHONY, A. W., "Concerning College Trustees," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 19:425-31, December 1933.

BEACH, Mark B., "Professional Versus Professorial Control in Higher Education," Educational Record, 49:363-73, Summer 1968.

BEACH, Mark B., Professors, Presidents and Trustees: A Study of University Governance, 1825-1918, Dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1966.

BLACK, Max, F. G. Marcham, and George Winter, "Faculty-Trustee Relations: A Panel Discussion in Three Parts," AAUP Bulletin, 42:613-24, December 1956.

BOGERT, George C., "Faculty Participation in American University Government," AAUP Bulletin, 31:72-82, 1945.

BORDEN, Fanny, "A List of References on College and University Government and Administration, 1819-1920," Vassar College Bulletin, May 1921.

BORN, William M., Historical Development of Governing Boards of State Universities in the United States: An Analysis of Some Trends and Portents, Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.

BOWMAN, I., "Determination of University Policy," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 34:221-5, October 1948.

BOYER, Ernest L., "A Fresh Look at the College Trustee," The Educational Record, 49:274-79, Summer 1968.

BRYANT, V. S., "Responsibilities of Trustees of a State University," College and University, 33:13-21, Fall 1957.

BURGESS, K. F., "Trustee Function in Today's University and College," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 44:399-407, October 1958.

BURNS, Gerald P., Trustees in Higher Education, Independent College Funds of America (New York), 1966.

CAPEN, Samuel P., Management of Universities, Foster and Stewart (Buffalo, New York), 1953.

CARNEGIE FOUNDATION FOR ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING, Role of the College and University Trustee, 1962.

CATTELL, James McK., Editor, University Control, Science Press (New York), 1913.

CATTELL, James McK., "University Control," Science, 23:475-7, March 23, 1906.

CATTELL, James McK., "University Control," Science, 35:797-808, May 24, 1912, and 35:84-60, May 31, 1912.

CHAMBERLAIN, Thomas C., "Faculty Participation in University Government," School and Society, 13:691-4, June 18, 1921.

CHAMBERS, M. M., "Function of Lawy Control in Higher Education," School and Society, 48:532-5, October 1938.

CHAMBERS, M. M., "Position of University Governing Board in the Total Scheme of State Government," Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 1931, pp. 63-76.

CHAMBERS, M. M., "Who is the University? A Legal Interpretation," Journal of Higher Education, 30:320-4, June 1959.

CHEYNEY, Edward P., "Trustees and Faculties," School and Society, 2:793-806, December 4, 1915.

CLARK, Burton R., "Faculty Authority," AAUP Bulletin, 47:293-302, December 1961.

CLARK, Burton R., "Faculty Organization and Authority," in The Emerging University and Industrial America (Hugh Hawkins, Editor), D. C. Heath, 1970.

"College Administration," Science, 22:572-3, November 3, 1905.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, The Role of the Trustees, Columbia University Press, 1957.

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, "The Role of College and University Trustees: A Panel Discussion," North Central Association Quarterly, 28:290-7, 1954.

COMMITTEE T, "Place and Function of Faculties in University Government," AAUP Bulletin, 10:23-104, May 1924.

COMMITTEE T, "Report on Role of Faculties in College and University Government," AAUP Bulletin, 22:183-90, March 1936.

COMMITTEE T, "Place and Function of Faculties in University and College Government," AAUP Bulletin, 25:145-50, April 1939.

COMMITTEE T, "Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government," AAUP Bulletin, 26:171-85, April 1940.

COMMITTEE T, "Report on Role of Faculties in College and University Government, AAUP Bulletin, 34:55-66, Spring 1946.

COMMITTEE T, "Role of Faculties in College and University Government," AAUP Bulletin, 34:55-78, March 1948.

COMMITTEE T, "Place and Function of Faculties in College and University Government: Final Report on 1953 Study," AAUP Bulletin, 41:62-81, March 1955.

COMMITTEE T, "Response of the Survey Subcommittee," AAUP Bulletin, 55:180-5, June 1969.

COMMITTEE T, "Report of the Survey Subcommittee," AAUP Bulletin, 57:68-124, Spring 1971.

COOKE, Morris, Academic and Industrial Efficiency, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1910.

COWLEY, W. H., "Academic Government," The Educational Forum, :217-229, January 1951.

CRAIGHEAD, Edwin B., "Functions and Limitations of the Governing Board," Science, 38:319-326, September 5, 1913.

CREIGHTON, James E., "Government of American Universities," Science, 32:193-9, August 12, 1910.

CROSS, G. L., "Democracy in the Administration of Higher Education," College and University, 28:472-86, July 1953.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE, Report of the Committee on Trustee Organization, 1959.

DAVIS, P. H., "More to be Desired are They Than Gold...," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 44:391-8, October 1958.

DEIBLER, Frederick S., "Determination of Policy Under the Present Form of Colleges and University Government," AAUP Bulletin, 28:32-45, February 1942.

DIBDEN, A. J., "Role of Administration and Trustees: A Faculty View," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 44:536-44, December 1958.

DONOVAN, Herman L., "Changing Conceptions of the College President," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 43:40-52, March 1957.

DONOVAN, Herman L., "The Vanishing University Trustee," Peabody Journal of Education, 36:259-63, March 1954.

DRAPER, A. S., "University Presidency," Atlantic Monthly, 97:34-43, January 1905.

DURYEA, E. D., "Evolution of University Organization," in The University as an Organization (James A. Perkins, Editor), McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1973.

ELIOT, C. W., "Resemblances and Differences Among American Universities," Science, 22:769-84, December 15, 1905.

ELIOT, Charles W., University Administration, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1908.

ELLIOTT, Edward C., Editor, The Rise of a University, 2 vols., Columbia University Press, 1932.

ELLIOTT, Edward C., and M. M. Chambers, Charters and Basic Laws of Selected American Universities and Colleges, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1934.

ENGLEHARDT, Fred, "Administrative and Fiscal Control of State Universities and Colleges," Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 1930, pp. 90-8.

FARLOW, W. G., "University Government," Science, 11:11-17, January 5, 1900.

FESLER, J. W., "Functions of Boards of Trustees," AAUP Bulletin, 11:240-2, 1925.

FESLER, James W., "Functions of Boards of Trustees," Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 1924, pp. 56-60.

FOSTER, Frederick M., "University Government by Constitution," School and Society, 13:572-7, May 14, 1921.

FOSTER, William T., "College Presidency," Science, 37:653-8, May 2, 1913.

FOSTER, W. T., "Faculty Participation in College Government," School and Society, 3:594-9, April 22, 1916.

GARBARINO, Joseph, Faculty Bargaining: Change and Conflict, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975.

GASKILL, David L., "Functions of Governing Boards," Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 1924, pp. 43-47.

GOODSPEED, Thomas W., A History of the University of Chicago: The First Quarter Century, University of Chicago Press, 1972.

"Government of Universities," Science, 33:692-4, May 5, 1911.

HAGGARD, Anna B., "Functions of Governing Boards," Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 1924, pp. 47-55.

HARVEY, James, "College Trustees," Currents 71, ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, No. 3, June 1971.

HEILBRON, Louis H., The College and University Trustee, Jossey-Bass, 1973.

HEWETT, W. T., "University Administration," Atlantic Monthly, 50:505-18, October 1882.

HILL, David S., Control of Tax-Supported Higher Education in the United States, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1934.

HISCOCK, Frank H., et al., "Faculty Participation in the Government of Cornell University," School and Society, 3:247-9, February 12, 1916.

HOFSTADTER, Richard, and Walter P. Metzger, The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States, Columbia University Press, 1955.

HOTCHKISS, Eugene, Jacob Gould Schurman and the Cornell Tradition, Dissertation, Cornell University, 1960.

HUGHES, Raymond M., "College and University Trustees and Their Responsibilities," Educational Record, 26:27-32, January 1945.

HUGHES, Raymond M., "Function of Boards of Trustees," AAUP Bulletin, 11:242-6, 1925.

HULL, W. Frank, and Allen H. Shapiro, The University Trustee in Law, University of Toledo (Ohio), 1973.

JAMISON, Charles L., "The Executive Committee System at the University of Michigan," AAUP Bulletin, 34:79-86, March 1948.

JASTROW, Joseph, "The Academic Career As Affected by Administration," Science, 23:561-74, April 13, 1906.

JOHNSTON, J. B., "University Organization," Science, 38:908-18, December 26, 1913.

JOHNSTON, W. D., "American University Statutes," Educational Review, 48:300-4, October 1914.

KILPATRICK, W. H., "College Management: A Problem in Apportioning Control," AAUP Bulletin, 25:455-60, October 1939.

KIRKPATRICK, James E., Academic Organization and Control, The Antioch Press, 1931.

KIRKPATRICK, James E., The American College and Its Rulers, New Republic (New York), 1926.

KIRKPATRICK, James E., "Place and Function of Faculties in University Government and Administration," School and Society, 12:22-3, July 3, 1920.

LEE, Sidney, "American Method of Appointing University Professors," Science, 18:89-90, July 17, 1903.

LEIGHTON, Joseph A., "Functions of Faculty in Administration," AAUP Bulletin, 12:346-57, 1926.

LEIGHTON, Joseph A., "University Government," Educational Review, 60:363-75, December 1920.

LOWELL, A. Lawrence, "Faculty and Governing Boards," School and Society, 13:236-7, February 19, 1921.

MARTIN, F. W., "Government of American Universities," Science, 32:343-4, September 9, 1910.

MARTORANA, S. V., and E. V. Hollis, State Boards Responsible for Higher Education, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1960.

MATHER, J. Paul, "Public Trusteeship -- Pegasus or Dead Horse?" Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 1956, pp. 38-48.

McGRATH, Earl J., "The Control of Higher Education in America," The Educational Record, 17:259-72, April 1936a.

McGRATH, Earl J., "The Evolution of Administrative Offices in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States from 1860 to 1933," Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1936b.

McVEY, Frank L., "Administrative Relations in Colleges," School and Society, 28:705-9, December 8, 1928.

MENKE, Robert F., "Governing Boards and Their Functions in Institutions of Higher Education," College and University, 27:243-6, January 1952.

METZGER, Walter P., Academic Freedom in the Age of the University, Columbia University Press, 1955.

METZGER, Walter P., "Origins of the Association," AAUP Bulletin, 52:229-37, Summer 1965.

MUNRO, W. B., "Boards of Trustees and College Faculties," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 27:315-22, May 1941.

MILLER, G. A., "Appointments in Colleges and Universities," Science, 28:561-2, October 23, 1908.

MILLER, Ralph L., "Regent's Role in University Management," Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions.

MUNROE, James B., "Address to the Conference of Trustees of American Colleges and Universities on October 17, 1905," reprinted in J. McKeen Cattell (Editor), University Control, Science Press (New York), 1913.

NASON, John W., The Future of Trusteeship: Role and Responsibility of College and University Boards, Association of Governing Boards (Washington, D. C.), 1974.

"Nebraska: Plan for Faculty Participation in Recommendations for Promotions," AAUP Bulletin, 10:38-40, March 1924.

NECKERS, J. W., "College Faculty Senate," AAUP Bulletin, 25:574-7, December 1939.

PALMER, A. M., "College President and His Board of Trustees," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 17:505-11, December 1931.

"Perplexities of a College President," Atlantic Monthly, 85:483-93, April 1900.

PETERSON, George E., The New England College in the Age of the University, Amherst College Press, 1964.

PRITCHETT, Henry S., "Colleges and Universities -- Shall They Become Business Corporations?" Science, 22:504-5, October 20, 1905.

PRITCHETT, Henry S., "The Democracy of the American College," Educational Review, 60:376-85, December 1920.

PRITCHETT, Henry R., "Development of an Effective Board of Government," Annual Report, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1911, pp. 112-15.

RAUH, Morton A., "Governing Boards: A Redefinition," in New Teaching, New Learning (G. Kerry Smith, Editor), Jossey-Bass, 1971.

RAYSOR, T. M., "Faculty Representation on Governing Boards," AAUP Bulletin, 23:287-8, April 1937.

"Representation of Faculty on the Board of Trustees at Cornell," School and Society, 1:601, April 24, 1915.

RIESMAN, David, Constraint and Variety in American Education, Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958.

RUML, Beardsley, and Donald Morison, Memo to a College Trustee, McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

SABINE, G. H., "Place and Function of Faculties in University and College Government," AAUP Bulletin, 24:141-50, February 1938.

SHAW, Wilfred, "A New Power in University Affairs: The Alumni," Scribners Magazine, 71:677-84, January 1922.

SCHURMAN, Jacob G., "Faculty Participation in University Government," Science, 36:703-7, November 22, 1912.

SNYDER, Franklyn B., "Faculty and University Administration," AAUP Bulletin, 25:295-309, June 1939.

STEVENSON, John S., "University Administration," Science, 22:844-5, December 22, 1905.

STILLMAN, J. M., "Organization of University Government," Science, 23:536-40, April 16, 1906.

SUPER, C. W., "College Tyranny," Nation, 84:540, June 13, 1907.

TEAD, Orday, "The Role of the College Trustee Today," The Educational Record, 44:258-65, July 1963.

THOMPSON, Alan R., "Professor and the Governing Board," AAUP Bulletin, 35:678-87, December 1949.

THWING, Charles F., College Administration, The Century Company, 1900.

THWING, Charles F., The American College: What It Is and What It May Become, The Platt and Peck Company (New York), 1914.

"University Control," Science, 35:19-28, 174-86, 893-903, 964-7, 1912.

"University of Cincinnati and Its Presidency," Science, 19:661-7, April 22, 1904.

VACCARO, L. C., "Conflict of Authority in the University," College and University, 44:232-9, Spring 1969.

VACCARO, L. C., "Power and Conflict in the University: A Search for Solutions," College and University, 44:97-107, Fall 1968.

VAN HISE, Charles R., "Appointment and Tenure of University Professors," Science, 33:237-44, February 17, 1911.

WESTBROOK, F. F., "State Responsibility in University Education," Science, 26:849-64, December 20, 1907.

WILDERMUTH, Ora L., "A University Trustee Views the Academic Profession," AAUP Bulletin, 35:233-9, Summer 1949.

WILDERMUTH, Ora L., "Legal Status of American State Universities," Proceedings, Association of Governing Boards of State Universities and Allied Institutions, 1940, pp. 53-76.

WOODEN, W. P., "State Universities: Legislative Control of a Constitutional Corporation," Michigan Law Review, 55:728, 1957.

WORKS, George A., "Coordination of Effort in the Field of Higher Education," School and Society, 35:519-25, April 16, 1932.

WRISTON, Henry M., "Looking at the College Presidency in Retrospect," Association of American Colleges Bulletin, 41:504-18, December 1955.

ZWINGLE, J. L., and W. V. Mayville, College Trustees: A Question of Legitimacy, Reports, American Association for Higher Education, 1934.

ZWINGLE, J. L., and Mabel E. Roberts, State Boards Responsible for Higher Education 1970, Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972.